

Remarks and Arguments

Claims 1-13 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, as indefinite. In particular, the examiner has stated that the claims provide for the use of a method, but do not set forth any steps involved in the method/process. Claims 1-13 were also rejected under 35 U.S.C. §101, with the examiner stating that "an improper definition of a process, *i.e.*, results in a claim which is not a proper process claim."

In order to address each of the examiner's rejections, Claims 1-13 have been amended herein in an effort to clarify them both as to formal structure and as to content. The scope of the claims has not been modified. However, independent method Claim 1 has been amended to clearly delineate the method as a sequence of steps that define it. In addition, the dependent claims of the application have been amended to clarify their content, and to better correspond to the amendments made to Claim 1. New Claims 14-20 have been added to provide coverage for the invention as an apparatus. With the amendments made to Claims 1-13, these claims are now believed to be sufficiently definite and in a proper format to satisfy both 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph and 35 U.S.C. §101. Reconsideration of Claims 1-13, and acceptance of new Claims 14-20, is respectfully requested.

In light of the foregoing amendments and remarks, it is respectfully requested that all the claims be allowed such that the application may be passed to issue. If it is believed that a telephone conference will help expedite prosecution of the application, the examiner is invited to call the undersigned. The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any additional fees due for this paper to applicants' attorneys' Deposit Account No. 02-3038.

Respectfully submitted


Philip L. Conrad, Esq. Reg. No. 34,567
KUDIRKA & JOBSE, LLP
Customer Number 021127
Tel: (617) 367-4600 Fax: (617) 367-4656

Date: July 14, 2004